

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 are independent claims. Claims 1-31 stand rejected.

Interview Summary

Applicant's representative thanks the examiners for the telephonic interview conducted on March 14, 2008. The substance of the interview is described in the remarks below and the amendments to the claims. Examiners agreed that the cited references do not teach sending a range of addresses to another network element as is claimed.

Specification

The examiner objected to the title of the invention as not descriptive. The examiner maintains that a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and maintains that the current title: "Propagation Of Information On An Indexed Addressed Network" is descriptive of the invention and traverse the rejection.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The examiner indicated that Paragraph 14 under the Summary of Invention contains an incomplete sentence that begins, "The network", but does not complete the statement.

Applicant has amended the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 stand objected to because of the following informalities:

The examiner maintains that claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 each recite the limitation "**the range of addresses**" and that this limitation lacks insufficient antecedent basis. Each claim also recites the limitation "**one to one mapping of the address from the first set.**" The limitation should be corrected to read "**addresses.**"

Applicant has amended the claim and respectfully submits that the objection is overcome.

Claim 25 recites the limitation “**the another element.**” The examiner maintains that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Applicant has amended the claim and respectfully submits that the objection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-18, and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Warhol Worms: The Potential for Very Fast Internet Plagues published on February 13, 2002 by Weaver (referred to herein as "Weaver").

As for claims 1, 9, and 17, the examiner maintains that Weaver discloses determining a sequential first set of network addresses, citing Weaver; New Infection Strategies. Applicant does not dispute that Weaver teaches the sequential first set of addresses as indicated by the examiner. The examiner continues that Weaver also discloses “mapping the range of addresses to a second set of addresses wherein the second set of addresses is a one to one mapping of the address from the first set and wherein the addresses in the second set are not in increasing address order” in that Weaver discloses generating a permutation of the first set of addresses. In the disclosed permutation scan of Weaver, “an already infected machine responds differently than a potential target.” In other words, it is not clear from the reference that permutation scanning maps *every* address from a first set of addresses to a second set of addresses.

The claim also requires traversing the second set of addresses to find another element of the network and then transferring the data to the another element of the network and with an indication of at least a portion of the addresses remaining in the second set. Again the examiner cites to Weaver but provides little indication where such limitations are found in Weaver.

The claims perform a one to one mapping of a first address space and then transfers the remaining addresses in the second set to the identified network element. The present invention provides for randomization by the use of a one to one mapping to a non sequential address space, e.g., using a primitive on the address space. Consequently an apparent randomized address space can be divided among many different machines while avoiding the

collisions described with respect to the permutation algorithm of Weaver.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-18, and 20-24 patentably define over Weaver. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 11, 19, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weaver and in further view of Simulating and Optimizing Worm Propagation Algorithms published on September 29, 2003 by Vogt (denoted herein as "Vogt").

As for claims 3, 11, and 19, Applicants submit that they depend from independent claims 1, 9 and 17. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that they also patentably define over Weaver in view of Vogt.

As for claim 25, as with the independent claims 1, 9 and 17, Weaver alone or in combination with Vogt fails to teach or suggest a one to one mapping of a first addresses to a second set of addresses as claimed and then transferring portions of the addresses in the second set to the identified network elements. The present invention provides for randomization by the use of a one to one mapping to a non sequential address space, e.g., using a primitive on the address space. Consequently an apparent randomized address space can be divided among many different machines while avoiding the collisions described with respect to the permutation algorithm of Weaver.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 25 is not rendered obvious by Weaver in view of Vogt.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2934/306552.01
Application No.: 10/792,254
Office Action Dated: December 17, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: March 17, 2008

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439